



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,481	03/09/2001	Paul Willard	NEXTP007	5875
32914	7590	10/31/2007	EXAMINER	
GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION 3000 THANKSGIVING TOWER 1601 ELM ST DALLAS, TX 75201-4761			SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/31/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/802,481	WILLARD ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
Narayanswamy Subramanian	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) "Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicants' request for continued examination filed on November 20, 2006. Amendments to claims 1, 5 and 9-14 have been entered. Rejections made under 35 USC 112, second paragraph in the last office action have been withdrawn in view of the amendments. Claims 1-14 are currently pending and have been examined. The rejections and response to arguments are stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-14 recite the limitations "if the set of offers includes at least one offer that meets all of the requested terms, selecting from among the set of offers a selected offer that meets all of the requested terms; if the set of offers does not include at least one offer that meets all of the requested terms but includes at least one offer that meets at least one of the preferred requested terms, selecting from among the set of offers a selected offer that meets the at least one of the preferred requested terms". It is not clear as to what happens "if the set of offers does not include at least one offer that meets any of the requested terms or at least one of the preferred requested terms" rendering the scope of the claims indeterminate. It is not clear how the objective of transmitting a customized offer to an applicant, recited in the preamble of the claims, is achieved if this condition is met. Hence the scope of the claim remains indeterminate. Appropriate correction/clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory Subject matter.

35 USC 101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a "new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof" (emphasis added).

Claims 1-14 are drawn to "A method of transmitting a customized offer to an applicant". As such the claimed invention is directed to a judicial exception to 35 U.S.C. 101 (i.e., an abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature) and is not directed to a practical application of such judicial exception because the claims do not require any physical transformation and the invention as claimed does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. For instance if the set of offers does not include at least one offer that meets all of the requested terms or at least one of the preferred requested terms, then it is not clear as to what happens. The method then stops with determining a set of offers for the customer, which does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued opinions in State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc., 149 F. 3d 1368, 47 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998) and AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc., 172 F.3d 1352, 50 USPQ2d 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1999). These decisions explained that, to be eligible for patent protection, the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and

tangible result.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601 02. To satisfy section 101 requirements, the claim must be for a practical application of the § 101 judicial exception, which can be identified in various ways: (a) The claimed invention “transforms” an article or physical object to a different state or thing. (b) The claimed invention otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, based on the factors discussed below.

The USPTO’s official interpretation of the utility requirement provides that the utility of an invention has to be (i) specific, (ii) substantial and (iii) credible. See MPEP § 2107.

The tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had “no substantial practical application”).

For an invention to produce a “concrete” result, the process must have a result that can be substantially repeatable or the process must substantially produce the same result again. In re Swartz, 232 F.3d 862, 864, 56 USPQ2d 1703, 1704 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (where asserted result produced by the claimed invention is “irreproducible” claim should be rejected under section 101). The opposite of “concrete” is unrepeatable or unpredictable.

There is no useful, concrete and tangible result produced from implementing the steps of the claimed invention if one of the contingencies in the claimed invention discussed above is not satisfied. The dependent claims are rejected for the same reason and by way of dependency on a rejected independent claim.

Response to Arguments

6. In response to applicant's assertion "It is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art could interpret the rejected claims so as to understand how to avoid infringement. There is nothing ambiguous about the interpretation of the meaning of the claim: a selected offer is transmitted to the applicant when at least one of the set of offers meets all of the requested terms or if no offers include all of the requested terms, then an offer that meets at least one of the preferred requested terms is transmitted. Not specifying what happens when it is determined that none of the set of offers meets all of the requested terms and further none of the set of offers meets at least one preferred requirement is not necessary to enable interpretation to avoid infringement. Therefore, it is submitted that omissions of an "if not" statement does not render the claims indefinite, and that the claims meet the statutory requirements", the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the rejection above, the scope of the claimed invention, taken as a whole, is indeterminate because it is not clear as to what happens if the third condition of "if the set of offers does not include at least one offer that meets any of the requested terms or at least one of the preferred requested terms" is met. Hence the rejection is maintained.

In response to applicant's assertion "It is respectfully submitted that a tangible, concrete and useful result is produced by the claimed method. The examiner contends that the result is not repeatable or reproducible, and thus it cannot be "concrete." However, this is simply not correct. If either of two criteria is met, an offer transmission is made. Each time the process is followed, the transmission is made. The result is reproduced each time. The result is plainly concrete", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner agrees with the applicant's assertion that if either of two criteria is met, an offer transmission is made. However when the third condition of "if the

set of offers does not include at least one offer that meets any of the requested terms or at least one of the preferred requested terms" is met, it is not clear as to what is the result of following the process. Hence the result is not useful, tangible and concrete when the third condition is met. Hence the claimed invention taken as a whole fails to produce useful, tangible and concrete result.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Narayanswamy Subramanian whose telephone number is (571) 272-6751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached at (571) 272-6771. The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft to the Patent Office is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 3691

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PMR only. For more information about the PMR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Dr. N. Subramanian
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3691

October 29, 2007